

New search << Search Save as

Find filters OASIS ... Type: All Closed, ... Assign... Contains text More Search Advanced

FILTERS Component: cts

- My open issues
- Reported by me
- All issues
- Open issues
- Done issues
- Viewed recently
- Created recently
- Resolved recently
- Updated recently
- FAVORITE FILTERS
- ReqResponse It...

1-27 of 27

Columns

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution
Editorial - narrative - Trevor Hardy	Toby Considine	editorial	Trevor Hardy, PNNL https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00000.html	ENERGYINTEROP-664	<p>page 9 line 23-26: This paragraph seems out of place as it is getting into the specifics of how any TE system should be designed, not just one using CTS.</p> <p>page 9 line 41-42 Since CTS doesn't define the full protocol stack, interoperability with minimal or no change is not guaranteed.</p> <p>page 10 line 53-54 What is meant by "none are interoperable either at the system level or for the actors"? Surely the systems were function and thus allowed the participants to interoperate. Do you means they weren't standardized and didn't interoperate across demonstrations and deployments?</p> <p>page 16 line 268-269 "CTS message may be thought of as..." Are there consequences if I think of them in a different way? That is, perhaps the "may" should be changed to "must" or "shall" if that is the best and only way to think of them.</p> <p>page 30 line 668 "CTS Delivery is used to report and power flow from a node..." may not be the sentence you're trying to write. The meaning is unclear to me.</p> <p>page 30 line 668 "Every contract involves a includes a party that promises..." Something got messed up here.</p> <p>page 30 line 674 "In most TE markets, taking a greater delivery than contracted for in any interval..." Back-to-back prepositions are not clear to me.</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	<p>Comment 1: add reference the to approved Energy Interoperation note, [TEMIX]specifying constant rate of delivery.</p> <p>Comment 2: specifically address protocol stack issues</p> <p>Comment 3: eliminated reference to thought</p> <p>Comment 4: Adopted clarifying verbiage from comment</p> <p>Comment 5: This section was vague to many. Re-wrote the two introductory paragraphs to respond to this comment which will be overwritten, potentially, as other comments are addressed.</p> <p>Comment 6: Agreed. See response to comment 5. Re-wrote from passive to active voice.</p> <p>Comment 7: See comment 6.</p>
Tender Update	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html	ENERGYINTEROP-726	<p><b>Tender Facet - Update</b></p> <p>The standard does not call for an Update Tender payload. There are multiple practical instances where an actor would have to update an uncommitted tender. The alternative of canceling and resubmitting, introduces more implementation complexity, excessive communication, and dead time of potential missed transactions. [Lines 545]</p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	<p>No action.</p> <p>A capability to Update Tender potentially creates complex distributed agreement protocol issues. What is the status of an already issued contract that partially consumed a Tender, and still referencing that Tender, if the Price and/or the Quantity of that tender</p>

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution
								<p>is Updated? In cases where the matching engine uses Time if Issue to award contract to the earlier of two similar tenders, is the original Tender date or the Updated Tender Date used?</p> <p>The indicated action, that the Actor cancel the original tender and issues the new, is the appropriate choice. The expectation is that any part of the Tender consumed by a Contract prior to the "cancel" stands as it is.</p>
Mantissa and Scale throughout spec	Toby Considine	CLARITY PREREQ	H Walter Johnson <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00007.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00007.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-696	<p>Interesting work. Thanks for the opportunity to review. Here are a few things I noticed as I read through the doc.</p> <p>The definition of <b>Scale</b> in Table 3-3 appears to be incorrect. <b>Scale</b> is defined there as the <b>Mantissa that specifies the size of the Resource Unit</b> and the example given states that <b>megawatts</b> has a mantissa of 6. Assuming we are working in base 10, the prefix mega- refers to the 6th power of 10 (<math>10^6</math>), where 6 is the EXPONENT of the number, not the mantissa. In standard scientific notation, <b>mantissa</b> refers to the digits without the <math>10^n</math> part. Therefore, the definition of <b>scale</b> should be the EXPONENT of the size prefix (<b>mega</b> or 6 in the example), not the mantissa (the fractional part or <b>precision</b> of the number).</p> <p>Nevertheless, the effect of the definition of scale is correct: the example for <b>Size</b> (5 kW), with the explanation that the 5 is the size and 3 is the scale, makes sense, since the scale part of this is kilo-<math>\hat{a}</math> (<math>10^3</math>) and thus the exponent (NOT the mantissa) of <math>5 \times 10^3</math> is 3. But why is Size constrained to be an <b>integer</b>? Why not allow a Product to have a fractional Size (for example "0.5 MW") rather than requiring this to be expressed as <b>500 kW</b> (or even <b>500000 W</b>)?</p> <p>I'm not sure that I understand the example of <b>Stream Payload Mantissa</b> in Table 5-1, but it seems to contain the same confusion between mantissa and exponent.</p> <p>The definition of <b>Quantity Scale</b> in Table 6-2 definitely confuses mantissa and exponent.</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	Applied suggested clarifications.
Actor vs Party	Toby Considine	ARCH-CONF CLARITY	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-677	<p>1. The Proposal introduces Actor as a synonym with Party. There is no apparent advantage to the change.</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	Actor is not a synonym of Party, although they may be identical in some architectures / implementations. There may be Actors that are not Parties, that is, do not participate in

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution				
								market activities. Strengthened Party discussion in reference to Actors as in Table 2-1				
Shane Calderwood Comments	Toby Considine	None	Shane Calderwood, NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab. <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00002.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00002.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-666	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>322</td> <td>Is the reference ID able to be used as a correlation ID? From my understanding, there is a different referece ID for each message so wouldn't another field holding the reference ID of the sender need to be created in order to use the reference ID for correlation?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>560</td> <td>Could this tender ID be used as a correlation ID? It may be helpful to add this information.</td> </tr> </table>	322	Is the reference ID able to be used as a correlation ID? From my understanding, there is a different referece ID for each message so wouldn't another field holding the reference ID of the sender need to be created in order to use the reference ID for correlation?	560	Could this tender ID be used as a correlation ID? It may be helpful to add this information.	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Updated discussion to address this comment.
322	Is the reference ID able to be used as a correlation ID? From my understanding, there is a different referece ID for each message so wouldn't another field holding the reference ID of the sender need to be created in order to use the reference ID for correlation?											
560	Could this tender ID be used as a correlation ID? It may be helpful to add this information.											
Resource is unneeded	William Cox	CLARITY RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-683	7. The Proposal's definition of a Resource is inconsistent with the definition of a Resource in EMIX and is not used in TEMIX.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>The Energy Interoperation 1.0 Resource " ... extends the EMIX Resource Description Type."</p> <p>The Resource description in CTS (and discussion of Resource-Product-Instrument) is consistent with the literature on Transactive Resource Management, and provides a strongly-typed view of the payloads consistent with current software engineering practice.</p> <p>No action beyond clarification of the model.</p>				
Position Service unworkable	William Cox	FACET	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-686	10. The Proposal's discussion of a Position Service is incomplete and likely unworkable because of design flaws in the Proposal.	21/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>No action.</p> <p>Not clear what's claimed unworkable.</p> <p>The Position Facet is used in working open source code.</p>				
Instrument is Unnecessary	William Cox	CLARITY RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-680	5. The addition of Instrument as a Product for a Duration in the Proposal is unnecessary, and any market engine that requires Instruments can apply the instrument concept in its interface with TEMIX.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>Expanded discussion of Resource/Product /Instrument to indicate that they are conceptual aids to understanding the specification as a series of refinements to wants. The informational elements of "What are you trading [Power], at what scale [MW] and over what duration [1 hour] beginning at what time are still expressed as separate information elements as they were in the TEMIX profile. (Sections rewritten)</p> <p>The use of Instruments is standard in financial</p>				

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution
								markets in contrast to a full and possibly complex product description.
Joseph Passalacqua Comments (editorial)	Toby Considine	editorial	Joseph Passalacqua NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00002.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00002.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-737	367 Italicize See Section 2.2.3 and explain what the name is like how it was done in Market Context, and Standard Terms See Section 6. "Market Facet" 387 What is [Ei]? Maybe an explanation on that. Is it related to Energy Interoperation? As seen on pg 25. Explanation on using Ei is clear 432 Maybe try to fit the contents on page 25 if possible so there's not a big clear page.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	Apply editorial corrections.
Location missing	Toby Considine	RES-PROD-INSTR	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-678	2. There is no formal role in the Proposal for Location as in TEMIX.	23/Mar/22	APPLIED	Included location in the Party Registration Facet.
Update UML Diagrams	William Cox	None	William Cox	ENERGYINTEROP-742	The UML diagrams are out of date. The use of CtsStreams (a single-element stream instead of an interval) and the semantics of multiple CtsStreams intervals as related to TGROUP need to be addressed. Position and Delivery - natural application, with examples. Be clear on how CtsStreams are used with load curves.	27/Apr/22	APPLIED	Update UML class and sequence diagrams throughout.  CtsStreams integration pending; attributes for classes as shown,  Defer integration in Tenders with demand/supply curves due to complexity.
Clarify Position	Toby Considine	FACET	Donald Hammerstrom <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-718	• An Actor owns a Position via an accumulation of Instruments.	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	Clarify text and add footnote "One may say that a Party's position for an instrument is evolved from an accumulation of trades for that instrument."
Transactive State	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-730	<b>Transactive State</b> Transactive state values are not documented in CTS nor [EMIX]. While one can imply the meaning, the boundaries of each state seem vague when analyzed. Is there an implied order too? What state would a delivered and settled tender take? Delivery or publication? What about in a market where settlement occurs at the time of the transaction before delivery? Having the same transactive state map over both tenders and transaction is a stretch when taking the individual values. This dual-use also becomes a source of conflictual information and implementations intent between a tender transactive state and the transaction transactive state. <i>[Lines 555, 599]</i>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	Remove Transactive State and discussion.
Support Pub/Sub as well as SOA	William Cox	ARCH-CONF CLARITY	Rolando Herrero <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-692	Page: 16, Line: 267-269 -> Message transport is affected by the topology. SOA is typically client/server while many of the modern IoT topologies are publish/subscribe (relying on MQTT or AMQP session management). This document should take into account the support of this latter scenario.	07/Feb/22	APPLIED	Reworked text and moved to Section 1 Introduction.
Streams and Intervals	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Donald Hammerstrom <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org">https://lists.oasis-open.org</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-711	The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment" There are	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	No action - see notes. Parallel between

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution
			<a href="/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008">/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008</a> <a href="/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf">/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf</a>		30 specific recommendations in the "Specific Recommendations" section of the submitted Hammerstrom paper. I have numbered them all for traceability as I recombine them into specific issues. The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment" 28. Figure 11-2 (and elsewhere re payload intervals): I've observed that CTS streams reference integer interval series, whereas many interaction payloads reference Interval objects. It is unclear to me what, if anything, associates a Party's CTS streams to specific Instrument Interval objects.			Delivery Facet and Position Facet.
Transaction Facet	William Cox	<b>FACET</b>	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-731	<b>Transaction Facet</b> The interaction pattern and payload are confusing. The interaction diagram shows Party and a Counter Party with the Party initiating the <code>EiCreateTransactionPayload()</code> . This seems counterintuitive for a typical scenario, where a market actor would match two parties. For each of their contracts, one is the Party the other CounterParty. The market needs to notify each and confirm the transaction. What is the expected payload of the market sent to the two parties? <code>EiCreateTransactionPayload</code> or <code>EiCreatedTransactionPayload</code> ? In what scenario does a Market actor need to expose both? <code>_</code> If the latter, who would call <code>EiCreateTransaction</code> ? <i>[Lines 592]</i>	08/Feb/22	<b>APPLIED</b>	Clarified text.
Semantics of Units of Measure	Toby Considine	<b>PREREQ</b>	Steve Ray <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00006.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00006.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-670	The identification of units of measure described on lines 344 and 347 seems prone to error, since there is no specification for how a unit is identified. One party might transmit kW while another uses kiloWatt, and a third uses kiloW. I suggest one of the following remedies, in order of increasing commitment:1. (Easiest). Point to a persistent URI that uniquely identifies the desired unit, as documented at <a href="http://qudt.org">http://qudt.org</a> . For example, <a href="http://qudt.org/vocab/unit/KiloW">http://qudt.org/vocab/unit/KiloW</a> uniquely identifies a kiloWatt. This can be prefixed as unit:KiloW using the unit: prefix as registered at <a href="http://prefix.cc">prefix.cc</a>  2. Model the key concepts found at <a href="http://qudt.org">http://qudt.org</a> within the CTS standard, populated with just the necessary units for electricity transactions. These concepts include Quantity Kind (such as Power) and Unit (such as Watt). This would improve the likelihood of interoperability with future standards.  3. Adopt the <a href="http://qudt.org">http://qudt.org</a> specification (managed at <a href="https://github.com/qudt/qudt-public-repo">https://github.com/qudt/qudt-public-repo</a> ). While not yet a standard, QUDT is likely to bear a strong resemblance to the future Digital SI specification being developed under the auspices of the BIPM. Steve	08/Feb/22	<b>APPLIED</b>	Rewrote sections for improved clarity.
Order of streams	William Cox	<b>ARCH-CONF</b> <b>editorial</b>	Donald Hammerstrom <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org">https://lists.oasis-open.org</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-714	19. Line 452 – 3: Since conformant CTS implementations need not be owned by the	07/Feb/22	<b>APPLIED</b>	Agreed Simplify CtsStreams by

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution						
			/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf		same implementer, it is unwise to permit omission of the UID property. This permission to omit also appears in Tables 5-1 & 5-2.			requiring the local UID (typically an integer). (applied in ctsWD13, UML updated ctsWD14)						
Required encodings?	Toby Considine	CLARITY	Rolando Herrero  https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html	ENERGYINTEROP-667	Please find below the comments to the CTS draft.  Thanks./  Page: 10, Line: 76-80 --> Is SBE the recommended encoding for constrained IoT (embedded) devices ? What determines in what scenario/topology SBE (or JSON/XML) must be used? How is that negotiated?	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Text clarified.						
Incompatibility with existing TEMIX	Toby Considine	None	Edward G. Cazalet, TEMIX Inc  https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00001/Cazalet_Comments_on_CTS.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-665	Any changes from the TeMix profile [TEMIX] of Energy Interop (EI) and Energy Market Information Exchange (EMIX) must require clear justification because the changes may be incompatible with TEMIX, published a decade ago, that existing implementations have, may have, or will rely on otherwise the claimed interoperability of the Proposal will fail.	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Agree with the spirit of the comment, but it is not actionable.  CTS also adds additional services / facets to support additional scenarios. Not all services must be implemented in all markets/deployments.						
Joo Park comments (editorial)	Toby Considine	None	Joo Young Park, NJIT and Energy Mashup Lab. corrected comments in   https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00004.html	ENERGYINTEROP-668	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>576</td> <td>"Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID to use to indicate the" should be changed to "Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID. This is used to indicate the "</td> </tr> <tr> <td>643</td> <td>"For Position, a bounding interval is specified"   Comma should be added between position and 'a'</td> </tr> <tr> <td>669</td> <td>"Every contract involves a includes a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell" Should be changed to "Every contract involves a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell"</td> </tr> </table>	576	"Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID to use to indicate the" should be changed to "Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID. This is used to indicate the "	643	"For Position, a bounding interval is specified"   Comma should be added between position and 'a'	669	"Every contract involves a includes a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell" Should be changed to "Every contract involves a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell"	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Comment 1: Rewrote entire Note to be  "Among the Standard Terms for a Market is PartyID of that Market. This MarketID indicates the expectation that the market will match and clear the tender if possible. To indicate a bilateral exchange, i.e., a tender between two specific parties, the PartyID of the other Actor may be used."  Comment 2: accepted  Comment 3: Simplified language to "Every contract is between a Party that promises to buy and a Party that promises to sell"
576	"Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID to use to indicate the" should be changed to "Each market in a Marketplace has a standard term which is the Counter PartyID. This is used to indicate the "													
643	"For Position, a bounding interval is specified"   Comma should be added between position and 'a'													
669	"Every contract involves a includes a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell" Should be changed to "Every contract involves a party that promises to buy as well as a party that promises to sell"													
Editorial	Toby Considine	None	Donald Hammerstrom  https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00008/2111DJH_CTS_Review.pdf	ENERGYINTEROP-717	There are 30 specific recommendations in the "Specific Recommendations" section of the submitted Hammerstrom paper. I have numbered them all for traceability as I recombine them into specific issues. The original white paper/submission can be read in the URI under "environment" 13. Lines 355 – 6: Editing needed. 14. Lines 349 – 362: Recommend deleting since content was addressed by EMIX and is permitted as stated in Line 363. 15. Line 376: Editing needed. 25. Lines 596 – 7: Editing needed. 29. Section 12.1: Why must this [EI] content be	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Editorial changes and rewritten sections in ctsWD12						

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution												
					duplicated and not included simply by reference?															
Editorial	Toby Considine	editorial	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-736	<p><b>Minor types and formatting issues</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>"Is a means", double use of the word including.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>249</td> <td>Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>668</td> <td>"involves a includes"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>918</td> <td>ÂUnpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>980</td> <td>Typo used the word tame instead of the same.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Page 2</td> <td>Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.</td> </tr> </table>	10	"Is a means", double use of the word including.	249	Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.	668	"involves a includes"	918	ÂUnpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle	980	Typo used the word tame instead of the same.	Page 2	Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Typos corrected. Section 1 with TRM discussion has been rewritten for ctsWD13 and later.
10	"Is a means", double use of the word including.																			
249	Inconsistent use of periods on definitions.																			
668	"involves a includes"																			
918	ÂUnpaired closing quotes around man-in-the-middle																			
980	Typo used the word tame instead of the same.																			
Page 2	Keywords section, RFC2119 is a broken hyperlink.																			
Product, Instrument, and Interval	Toby Considine	None	Horia Pop; Lateral Inc <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202112/msg00001.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-728	<p><b>Tender Facet à Product, Instrument, and Interval</b></p> <p>Is not Interval a key aspect of an Instrument instead of a product? (Duration is an aspect of the product). <i>[Lines 555]</i></p>	08/Jan/22	APPLIED	Applied correction I265 WD12												
Binary & Enumerations	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Rolando Herrero <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00003.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-694	<p>Page: 30, Line: 30 -&gt; Some of these fields (like CURRENCY) should be binary encoded as enumerations (whenever possible). Specifically, many (IoT and non-IoT) devices in constrained environments rely on physical/link layer technologies (like IEEE 802.15.4) that are not designed to handle large payloads (even with upper layer adaptation)</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>Standards including UN-CEFACT for currency designations as strings are updated regularly, though the major currencies have had stable representations for decades.</p> <p>Typical currency designator strings are &lt;= 4 characters in length, or roughly the length of a long which is one encoding of an enumeration, so the payloads are identical in size.</p> <p>The TC cannot manage currency designators, as we do not control, only consume other standards.</p>												
FSGIM Streams Compatibility	William Cox	ARCH-CONF	Steve Ray <a href="https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00005.html">https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/energyinterop-comment/202111/msg00005.html</a>	ENERGYINTEROP-669	<p>Sections 1.6.3 and 1.6.4 (beginning at line 158) discuss conformance with WS-Calendar Streams and with FSGIM. It should be noted that FSGIM extended the idea of Streams beyond just a sequence of identical, contiguous intervals (as documented in the FSGIM User Guide, beginning at page 221). I would recommend that the CTS committee consider this more general specification, which supports the notion of Streams as well as other, less periodic sequences. Steve Ray</p>	10/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>Added footnote "Some specifications (e.g. [FSGIM]) have extended the basic [Streams] capabilities, but this brings additional complexity which does not benefit our use cases."</p>												
Improve consistency of Party / Counterparty in tables	Toby Considine	CLARITY	Pim van der Eijk	ENERGYINTEROP-656	<p>In writing the document, I noticed that the summary tables often have the same role names ("Party", "Party") but the activity diagrams use different roles ("Party",</p>	08/Feb/22	APPLIED	<p>Using the interaction diagrams in CS03, base for Public Review 3, the interaction diagram for</p>												

Summary	Assignee	Labels	Environment	Key	Description	Resolved	Status	Resolution
					<p>"CounterParty"). It might be clearer to have distinct roles in the summary tables that match the values in the activity diagram. (Other standards, such as UBL, do this in a similar way). If messages can go in either direction, the table should have a two rows for the two situations.</p> <p>The activity diagram in 7.5.1.1 has "Party" in both swimlanes, this could be changed to "Party", "CounterParty" as in the other diagrams for consistency.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EiDelivery correctly shows Party-Party (a 3rd party auditor)</li><li>• EiTransaction correctly shows Party-CounterParty (with a space in the RHS)</li><li>• EiTender correctly shows Party-CounterParty (with a space in the RHS)</li><li>• EiQuote shows Party-CounterParty (with a space in the RHS. For consistency this should show Party-Party, as there is no counterparty relationship in a quote.</li></ul> <p>Correct EiQuote Sequence Diagram to show Party-Party.</p> <p>The labels are correct (slightly different for e.g. delivery, i.e. Requestor-DeliveryActor) in CTS PR01.</p>

1-27 of 27